



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Bever (p. 193); Alais for Allais (p. 207); Pière Lacordaire (p. 224); St-Beuve (p. 229); Beaumier for Beaunier (p. 257); Wyzewa Th. (p. 261 and *passim*) for Wyzewa T. (Teodor de); Preston Herriet and Harriett (p. 287) for Harriet; Estherhazy for Esterhazy (p. 336), where also the dates of Reinach's *Hist. de l'Affaire Dreyfus* should be 1901, 1903, 1903, 1904, 1905; Hugs for Hugo (p. 369); De Amicio for De Amicis (p. 373); Pachen for Pacheu (p. 424); H. Sherard for R. H. Sherard (p. 442); B. N. Wells for B. W. Wells (p. 444); Sedgwich for Sedgwick (p. 486); P. Martin for B. Martin (p. 496); Goss for Gosse (p. 503). The volume testifies to its exotic printing place (Weimar) by the grave accent rakishly cocked upon the capital A (À) like the cap on an English Tommy Atkins, though the author is not consistent in its use even on his title page, and by a confusion between I, Y and J: Edmund Yates, the English journalist becomes Jates (p. 200); Yetta Blaze de Bury is Jetta (p. 40) and, on the other hand, the *Iambes* of Barbier become the *Jambes de Barbier* (p. 55), which reminds one of the derivation of *Jambus* in the prologue to Rabelais's Book II.

The second part, on works to be consulted in connection with the history of the French language, literature and civilization, although an afterthought, will prove a very useful portion of the book and might well be developed into an independent volume. As it stands, it contains much miscellaneous material, which might bear sifting. One is not inclined to complain at the presence of many references to works concerning or dating from the period before 1800 back to the Middle Ages, but Thurneysen on the accentuation of old Irish verbs (p. 478) seems remote from French versification, and the Credit Mobilier (p. 496) means nothing nearer France than the American congressional scandal of that name. On the other hand one misses (*e. g.*, on p. 468) any reference to Nordau's *Entartung*, one of the important contributions to the study of the symbolists and decadents.

Such slips do not seriously detract from the great value of Professor Thieme's handbook

for the convenience of his colleagues and of students of French in general.

C. H. C. WRIGHT.

Harvard University.

THE DRAMA.

DRAMATIC TRADITIONS OF THE DARK AGES.

As its author assures us in his preface, this work is not a history of the medieval drama, but an attempt "to hold a brief for one of the parties to a controversy which, in his opinion, has either been ignored or decided incorrectly, for nearly three-quarters of a millennium." In other words it is an effort to show that there was a continuous and popular drama written and acted in the Byzantine Empire throughout the middle ages and that this drama was the direct source not only of the medieval and Renaissance drama of Western Europe, but of all dramatic elements found in medieval literature, for "we may talk as much as we like about independent literary origins. The simple fact is that there has never been anything of the kind within the historical period."² The author claims no originality for this thesis, but acknowledges his debt to Constantine Sathas,³ whom he considers "a reformer in the history of the whole medieval period." Creizenach,⁴ Krumbacher,⁵ and Cloetta⁶ are quoted, chiefly to be combatted.

Mr. Tunison first takes up dramatic traditions connected with the war between the Greek church and the theatre, then the plays produced by that church through the influence of the

¹ By Joseph S. Tunison, Chicago, the University of Chicago Press, and London, T. Fisher Unwin, 1907, xviii + 350 pages.

² Page 333.

³ *Ἱστορικὸν Δοκίμιον περὶ τοῦ Θεάτρου καὶ τῆς μουσικῆς τῶν Βυζαντινῶν*, Venice, 1878.

⁴ *Geschichte des Neueren Dramas*, Halle, 1893.

⁵ *Geschichte der Byzantinischen Litteratur*, II, in Müller's *Handbuch der Klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft*, Munich, 1897.

⁶ *Beiträge zur Litteraturgeschichte des Mittelalters*, Halle, 1890-92.

stage. In the first of the four chapters into which the work is divided, called *Traditions Due to the War between Church and Theatre*, he expresses the opinion that the early persecutions of the Christians took on a dramatic form which produced the church's hostility to the theatre. Chrysostom's opposition to the stage and Arius's interest in it are especially accentuated. Some notice is taken of the action of the Council of Trullo regarding theatrical practices. Tunison believes that an ecclesiastical drama arose at Constantinople toward 500, that the Iconoclasts subsequently brought theatrical dancing and music into the churches and that actors were introduced there about 990, originating a festival that spread to Western Europe as the Feast of Fools. He concludes that "it is clear that Voltaire and those who followed him were right in deriving the ritual play and mystery from Constantinople."⁷

In his second chapter, *Dramatic Impulses in Religion*, Tunison continues his account of the Byzantine stage, treating the plays that were written for the church. He begins with the Apollinari in the fourth century and comes down to the Renaissance, making no chronological distinction between this and the preceding chapter. There he dwelt on traditions connected with disputes between the church and the theatre; he now takes up church plays themselves. Some elements appear in this second chapter that seem out of place, for we wonder what Heraclius's subsidizing of dramatic interests,⁸ the distinction between ballet-dancers and mimes,⁹ and the encouragement given by Constantine Porphyrogenitus to guild-plays¹⁰ have to do with dramatic impulses in religion.

Chief among the plays he mentions is, of course, the *Christus Patiens*, which he dates in the fourth century, contrary to the opinion of Krumbacher¹¹ and other scholars, who place it in the eleventh or twelfth. He meets

their linguistic arguments chiefly with the reflection that the critics "are prejudiced against the possibility of giving the work an early date, for the reason that it affects the study of the religious drama in the West."¹²

Having satisfied himself that a popular drama flourished at Constantinople, Mr. Tunison turns to Western Europe in order to prove the Byzantine origin of the medieval drama, the second part of his thesis. He had stated in his first chapter¹³ that the tropes of the church service from which most authors derive the medieval drama were themselves of Byzantine origin, a theory which he would prove by the statement that "the whole nomenclature of the science used in the construction of tropes and sequences is against those who wish to leave the lay reader under the impression that these amplifications of the liturgy originated in the West of Europe." Now, at the beginning of his chapter on *Eastern Tradition and Western Development*, he declares that modern historians have been influenced by patriotism to ascribe the origin of the medieval drama to Germany, England, or France, as the case may be. But the Greek, Sathas, has shown without *parti pris* that its origin is really Greek.

Chief among the western followers of the Byzantine drama he places the German nun Hrotsvitha and believes, contrary to Creizenach's opinion,¹⁴ that her plays were acted. Admitting that she was influenced by Terence, he concludes that her work is really derived from Byzantine plays, because he believes her plots to be from the hagiography of the Greek church, and because the abbess of her nunnery was the daughter of a Greek princess. Her dramatic influence, moreover, may be considered great, if we remember that the *Faust* legend, which she treats, was not forgotten and that she was quoted by "all writers who made any pretense of classic learning."¹⁵

Other examples of Byzantine dramatic influence are contained in the "disputes" of the troubadours, the Snow-Boy story, such tales as the *Querolus*, *Geta*, *Babio*, *Sadius* and *Galo*, etc.

⁷ Page 61. Voltaire would have the mystery brought back by Crusaders, just as he suggests that their pilgrimages were responsible for the fish and cockles found on top of the Alps.

⁸ P. 102.

¹⁰ P. 116.

⁹ P. 114.

¹¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 746-749.

¹² P. 71, note.

¹⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 17 seq.

¹³ P. 45, note.

¹⁵ P. 183.

If any scholars conclude with Cloetta¹⁶ that there was no continuous dramatic tradition from ancient to medieval times from the fact that the idea of tragedy and comedy was lost in the middle ages, as is shown by a number of definitions and the use of these words as titles to such works as Dante's *Divine Comedy* and the Greek "tragedies" of Krates, Oenomaos, and Diogenes,¹⁷ these objectors are confronted with the argument that "the miscellaneous use of the words 'tragedy' and 'comedy' and their cognates proves nothing . . . A newspaper man uses words of this kind in remotely derivative senses almost daily, and yet, if called upon, he could usually give a fair definition of each of them as restricted to the stage. In fact, an experiment upon a man who writes theatrical notices daily showed that his first thought, upon being asked the meaning of the word "tragedy" was not of the staged piece, but of some or any sorrowful occurrence or narrative, and his definition of "comedy" answered almost word for word to the group of definitions gathered by Cloetta from the whole range of medieval literature; and yet the man has a thorough professional knowledge of the theatre, with absolutely no knowledge whatever of the authors whom Cloetta cites."¹⁸

Another argument in favor of an independent origin for the medieval drama is the fact that this drama first appeared in Switzerland, England, France, and Germany, while Italy, the country nearest Byzantium was the last to develop it. We are wrong, however, if we draw any conclusions from this fact, for "the Italians knew well that these ecclesiastical dramas were not an evolution of the ritual" and "looked askance at the newcomer, more than suspicious of its origin, while the northern nations admired it as the proper offspring of the church." Tunison cites nothing in proof of this assertion.

But Italy, so loath to accept the religious drama of Byzantium, atoned for its indiffer-

ence by the numerous secular borrowings enumerated by Tunison in his last chapter, *The Mediation of Italy*. Our author considers personification in the eclogues of Theocritus and Virgil with Bede's imitations of them, Seneca's influence on Lydgate and on the play *Gorboduc*. He makes a digression on the history of the Roman drama and another on the *Winter's Tale*, mentions the dramatic qualities of the *Canterbury Tales*, of the *Fables of Adolphus*, the *Alda* of William of Blois, and other works, tracing their sources as far as he can to the Byzantine drama. He brings his book to a close with a genealogical dramatic tree, the main trunk of which "was successively Hellenic, Roman, Hellenistic, Byzantine, Italian." From the Hellenistic period comes the Christian drama; from the Byzantine, the "ecclesiastical theatre, the Morality and the Mystery"; from the Italian, the Spanish and English; "from the Spanish, the French comedy; from the English, the German. Such would be approximately what a complete analysis of the history of the drama must show."¹⁹

Mr. Tunison's idea of presenting in a fairly popular form a work on the dramatic traditions of an interesting age deserves commendation. The volume is attractively bound and named. The phraseology of the chapter headings is original. The passages of fine writing, pedantry, and slang are not sufficiently numerous to destroy the reader's interest. There are a number of pleasant anecdotes, some stories of more than passing interest. Any general reader who desires to be entertained in an atmosphere of learning will do well to read the book. I commend it to him heartily, for to him it is addressed.

To the scholar, however, to the scientific student of literary history the work is valueless. The author's attitude is prejudiced to a degree. He is constantly striving to establish Byzantine influence, using to that end the machinery of exaggeration, confusion, and solemn repetition of statements not yet proved. He seldom quotes documents at first hand, derives his facts from Sathas almost without

¹⁶ *Op. cit.*, *passim*.

¹⁷ These are romances. Cf. Krumbacher, *op. cit.*, p. 647.

¹⁸ P. 124.

¹⁹ P. 334.

criticism, has no bibliography and most incomplete foot-notes. Again and again he makes statements without giving proof or authority.²⁰ His material is largely undigested, very badly arranged.

To reconstruct a continuous Byzantine drama he calls to his aid the plays which formed a decadent prolongation of the ancient classic stage, but which ceased to be represented by the seventh century, and adds to them the later book-dramas and school imitations of classic authors, plays that were, as far as we can tell, neither acted nor intended for representation. References to the hippodrome, to circus performances, mimes and pantomines are held to refer to a real drama. He fails to consider the changing conditions of the Byzantine world, the influence of the Barbarians on its culture. To fill in the period from the seventh to the ninth century, which Krumbacher²¹ describes as cutting straight through the stage output and separating the ancient drama from the medieval, he brings forward such academic plays as the *Adam* of Ignatius (717). But by going twice over the period from the fourth century to the Renaissance and by a careful avoidance of all but the fewest dates, he creates the impression upon the casual reader that plays were written at Constantinople throughout the middle ages. I do not mean that he is intentionally insincere, for he seems to believe firmly in his thesis. His lack of accuracy may be due to his adherence to Sathas's work, which is notoriously ill-arranged.²² But this is hardly an excuse, for if Tunison's volume had a scholarly *raison d'être*, it would lie in his bringing order into the confusion of Sathas's treatise, a thing that he cannot be said to have accomplished.

Nor do we find Tunison's efforts at establishing Byzantine influence in the West more successful than they were at proving the existence of a continuous stage at Constantinople. He knows little of the medieval drama and dismisses with a few brief notes the mass of

scholarship devoted to tracing its development out of the church liturgy. His mistaken attitude towards Hroswitha's dramas has been shown in the *Nation*.²³ As a further example of his inaccuracy I quote his statement that Celtes's edition in 1501 of Hroswitha's plays antedates "all non-religious dramas in the West, except the two tragedies of Mussato and perhaps a Spanish comedy"²⁴ (the *Celestina*). He has forgotten *Pathelin*, *Robin et Marion*, *Griselidis* and other secular dramas of the middle ages. In the same connection he states that the *Celestina*, "though written in 1499, was practically unknown till much later." As a matter of fact, 1499 is merely the date of the earliest extant edition of the work, which was probably written about 1483.²⁵ The large number of its editions in the leading European languages throughout the sixteenth century belie Tunison's statement regarding its fame.

But his great mistake is the constant insistence upon Byzantine influence. Had he left this alone and confined himself to the facts of dramatic history, he would have written a book of some value and of decided interest. As it is, the volume is devoted to proving an impossible thesis in a manner that may mislead the careless reader, but will deceive no special student. Scholars will not take it over-seriously. They will be rather inclined to congratulate Mr. Tunison on the courage with which he has unsuccessfully assailed so orthodox an opinion as that of the independent origin of the medieval drama. They will congratulate him, too, on his acquaintance with Byzantine dramatic traditions, which are so much better known by him than they were by the authors of medieval plays in Western Europe.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER.

Amherst College.

²³ Especially in his statement that she derived her plots from Byzantine hagiography. *The Nation*, LXXXV, 287-288.

²⁴ P. 139.

²⁵ See Foulché-Delbosc in the *Revue Hispanique*, IX, 171-99.

²⁰ Cf., for example, pp. 6, 15, 38, 81, 102.

²¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 646.

²² Cf. Krumbacher, *op. cit.*, p. 647, note.